



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the Church of Rome, then, the Virgin receives divine worship of the same kind as was paid to her by the heretical Collyridians. And no other precedent for such worship can be found in the early history of the Church.

The subject, of which we have thus briefly treated in this article, is a very large, and, it is needless to add, a very important one. We commend it most earnestly to the attention of our Roman Catholic brethren, and we entreat them to look well to the foundations of those peculiar doctrines and practices which they have been taught to believe have been transmitted from the Apostolic times, and even from the Apostles themselves, to the present day; but many of which, we solemnly and deliberately repeat it, may be ultimately traced to heretical sources.

SPURIOUS WORKS ATTRIBUTED TO THE FATHERS.

ST. ATHANASIUS AND ST. BASIL.

THERE is, perhaps, no way in which learned men could do a greater service to the cause of religious truth, or promote the cause of primitive worship more effectually, than by clearing the field of Christian antiquity of those spurious and noxious weeds which the enemy of truth has, from age to age, sown so artfully, choking in many cases the genuine and good seed, and in others mingling subtle poison with the wholesome fruits of God's truth—we mean, clearing the genuine works of eminent writers of the primitive Church from the spurious and apocryphal ones, which during past ages have been pawned upon them by either ignorant or dishonest men.

We think we should do a good service to our unlearned fellow-countrymen, both Roman Catholic as well as Protestant, if we could furnish them with a catalogue of works which once passed as unquestioned writings of eminent Fathers of the Church, but which have since been detected and discarded by learned Roman Catholics as doubtful or spurious, and which, therefore, ought never to be relied on by controversialists, without, at least, noticing that, as *authorities*, they cannot safely be relied on by any one desirous of arriving at the truth.

We purpose to give here one or two instances of spurious writings, which will be found not unimportant on the subject we have been considering—the *Invocation of Saints*.

ST. ATHANASIUS, the great champion of the Catholic faith, who was born A.D. 296, and died A.D. 373, left behind him, for the edification of the world, a number of works, admitted by all to be genuine, which demonstrate that he was a man of the most glowing piety, but a piety centering in God alone; and that he placed his whole hope and confidence, in life and in death, in the mercies of God, through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, our only Mediator, Advocate, and Saviour. We have already given our readers a passage from St. Athanasius (see No. 30, p. 71), which shows what his views of prayer were; and we are satisfied that there is not a single passage to be found in his genuine writings giving countenance to any worship of the Virgin, or any other saint, or any belief in her or their power and intercession, or any invocation of any of them, even for their prayers.

We here challenge our Roman Catholic correspondents and their friends to produce any passage from the works of this eminent saint and champion of the faith to contradict what we have said; and, we are sure, they will do so, if any such passage is to be found.

The importance of having such a passage from so great an authority as St. Athanasius on the subject, if it were possible to find one, cannot be more strongly demonstrated than by the use which has been made by the most eminent Roman Catholic controversialist writers of a Homily formerly ascribed to that Father; but which has long been rejected as spurious by the most learned authorities among Roman Catholic writers, as we shall proceed to prove.

The homily referred to is to be found in the second volume of the Benedictine edition of St. Athanasius's works, p. 393 to 401,* and is entitled "On the Annunciation of the Mother of God;" or, as it is given in the Latin translation, "Sermo in Annuntiationem Sanctissimæ Domine nostræ Deiparæ."

Our first witness is Cardinal Bellarmine, who declares this treatise to be spurious, and that the evidence against it is so strong, that no one can doubt but that the author of it must have seen the decrees of the Councils against Nestorius, Eutyches, and the Monothelites, none of which were held until after St. Athanasius's death.†

Our second witness is Cardinal Baronius, in his letter to Thomas Stapleton, dated Rome, November, 1592, in which he deliberately decides against the genuineness of this homily, and fixes its date, at the very earliest, subsequently to the commencement of the seventh century, three hundred years after Athanasius attended the Council of Nicea. (See this well-known epistle in full, in the same volume of the works of St. Athanasius, above cited, p. 391.)

Our third authority is that of the learned Benedictine editors themselves, who, in their second volume, page 390, not only declare this homily to be unquestionably a forgery, assigning the reasons for their decision, but fortify their own judgment, by quoting, at length, the letter of Baronius, written more than a century before.

The Benedictine editors begin their preface thus—"That

this discourse is spurious, THERE IS NO LEARNED MAN WHO DOES NOT NOW ADJUDGE. The style proves itself, more clear than the sun, to be different from that of Athanasius. Besides this, very many trifles show themselves here unworthy of any sensible man whatever, not to say of Athanasius, and a great number of expressions unknown to Athanasius, so that it savours of lower Greek. And, truly, his subtle disputation of the hypostasis of Christ, and on the two natures of Christ, persuades us that the writer lived after the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon (held in 431 and 451—St. Athanasius died in 372), of which councils, moreover, he uses the identical words, whereas his dissertation on the two wills in Christ seems to argue, that he lived after the spreading of the error of the Monothelites" (which did not arise till A.D. 630, under the reign of Heraclius).

After such a decisive judgment of these most eminent writers, that the homily in question is spurious, that the evidence of it was as clear as the sun, and that no learned man could hold otherwise, one would think that no Roman Catholic writer, having the least pretension to learning and honesty, would have ever ventured to rely on it again as an authority in controversy, or a guide in practice.

Yet, how stands the case? The very same Cardinal Bellarmine, who has himself condemned it as a forgery, the evidence of which is irresistible, actually has the effrontery (or, at least, has been guilty of such *unpardonable negligence*) as to cite this very homily, as the authority of St. Athanasius* for the invocation of saints, without the slightest allusion to its admitted spuriousness, or even as to any doubt or suspicion being attached to it; and, in like manner, again cites it without any qualification whatever in proof of the antiquity of the Feast of the Annunciation, on which occasion this homily was alleged to have been delivered by Athanasius.†

Can any more instructive lesson be given to intelligent and honest inquirers, as to the necessity for caution touching the genuineness of the authorities relied on by their instructors, than to find such a man as Cardinal Bellarmine thus *self-condemned* of relying on a spurious work, given up by all learned Roman Catholics, and, amongst others, by HIMSELF?

Cardinal Bellarmine does not, however, stand alone in this painful position.

Will our readers believe that CARDINAL WISEMAN, in the middle of the nineteenth century, has been guilty of the same negligence or dishonesty in quoting the same homily as the genuine work of St. Athanasius, without the faintest shadow of an allusion to the combined judgment of Baronius, Bellarmine, and the Benedictine monks, or even to any suspicion being entertained of its being a forgery!

It is painful, even to an opponent, to be obliged to expose such reckless misrepresentation; and were not truth at stake, we should gladly draw a veil over what must assume the character of a personal charge against a person whose authority seems to have the highest place among our Roman Catholic brethren. Truth, however, calls on us fearlessly to lay open the expedients by which the worship of the Virgin Mary is attempted to be defended in our own country, and our own times; and Cardinal Wiseman owes it to his own character, to explain to the world, if he can, how he could have made such use of the homily in question. Now for our proof.

The cardinal (then Dr. Nicholas Wiseman, Bishop of Melipotamus) thus introduces and comments upon extracts from this spurious homily, in his lectures, vol. ii., p. 108. London: Bookers, 1836.

"St. Athanasius, the most zealous and strenuous supporter that the Church ever possessed of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and, consequently, of his infinite superiority over all the saints, thus enthusiastically addresses his ever-blessed mother—"Hear, now, O daughter of David; incline thine ear to our prayers; we raise our cry to thee—remember us, oh! most holy Virgin; and, for the feeble eulogiums we give thee, grant us great gifts from the treasures of thy graces—thou that art full of grace. Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; Queen, and Mother of God, intercede for us." "Mark well," continues Dr. Wiseman, "those words, 'grant us great gifts from the treasures of thy graces,' as if he hoped directly to receive them from her. Do Catholics use stronger words than these? Or did St. Athanasius think or speak with us as with Protestants?"‡

What will our candid readers think, when we tell them that these passages are from the very homily in question, and that Cardinal Wiseman refers for his authority for these passages to the very Benedictine edition, and the identical volume of the works of St. Athanasius, which contains the irrefutable proof of their spuriousness!—Page 401, vol. ii.

Cardinal Bellarmine may have possibly cited the homily before he discovered its spuriousness; though this is not likely, for in his preface to the reader, prefixed to the volume in which the treatise *De Scriptoribus Eccl.* occurs, printed at Cologne, A.D., 1617, he commences by stating that he had written this treatise forty years before. But what defence can CARDINAL WISEMAN make for referring to

a homily, which, if he had ever read it in his own edition he must have known had been given up as spurious for the last 250 years?

We shall be happy to hear what the Cardinal, or any of his friends or admirers, have to say in his defence, before we finally pronounce upon what appears to us to be utter recklessness, if not dishonesty; and as usual, our columns are open to any one who wishes to exculpate the Cardinal from the charge now made against him, or any others which we may feel obliged to make in our pages.*

Our next instance is one which we can dispose of more summarily.

SAINT BASIL, Bishop of Neocæsarea, died about A.D., 378. All Christians, whether in the earliest ages from his own times, or in more modern days, have agreed to do his memory honour; he is often appealed to under the title of the Great Teacher of truth, and acquired the name of the Great Basil, in contradiction to the multitude of bishops and pastors of the same name who succeeded him in other times, and were fully forty in number. We need scarcely be surprised, therefore, to find many confessedly spurious works ascribed to him; and the world is deeply indebted to the labours of the learned Benedictine editor, M. Julian Garnier, who has done so much towards the separation of the supposititious from the genuine works of this eminent writer.

In vol. iii., p. 69, Bened. Ed., Paris, 1730, the epistles attributed to St. Basil are arranged in three classes. First, those written by St. Basil before he was made bishop, A.D. 370; second, those which he wrote after he was bishop of Cæsarea, between 370 and 378; third, those without date, including many doubtful, and some spurious.

In page 462, vol. iii., appears one addressed to Julian the Apostate, numbered by the Benedictine editor 360, but originally printed as No. 205.

It is unhesitatingly ranked by the learned Benedictines, not merely as doubtful, but spurious; and no one, we apprehend, could open the book without, at once, noticing that it is so—for at the top of the page in which it occurs, are the words, printed in large capitals—S. BAS. CÆSARÆE CAPPADOC. ARCHIEP. EPISTOLÆ SPURIE.—See page 462, tom. iii. Benedict., Paris, 1730.

The epistle in question is also specially condemned, and the reasons given in the life of St. Basil, prefixed to the same work (c. viii., p. lxiii).

Let us now see the use made of this spurious epistle by eminent writers of the Church of Rome.

Dr. Milner, in his defence of saint worship, in his "End of Controversy," letter 35, page 353, cites two passages only from the primitive Fathers which have the slightest bearing in support of the doctrine. The first passage, which is from Justin Martyr, our readers will find commented on in another article in our present number, page 85.

The second passage purports to be from ST. BASIL, and is as follows:—"I invoke the Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs to pray for me, that God may be merciful to me, and forgive me my sins. I honour and reverence their images, since those things have been ordained by tradition from the Apostles, and are practised in all our Churches." Dr. Milner's reference is to Epis. 205, Paris edition (but without specifying the date).

Now, what is this 205th epistle but the very one to Julian the Apostate? and, we ask, did the Rev. Dr. Milner, who wrote in 1802, ever take the trouble of reading the epistle he thus quotes, or of looking at what the Benedictine editors, who wrote seventy years before, said of its undoubted spuriousness?

If Dr. Milner had the Benedictine edition before him when he wrote, we must pronounce him guilty of actual dishonesty, in concealing the fact that deprived the quotation of any authority; if he had not, what rashness was it for a man to assume the title of "*ending controversy*," when he did not even take the pains of knowing what the best writers of his own faith had written before him on the principal authority he relied on!

Truly, we cannot but be astonished at the risks which controversialists of the Church of Rome will run, when attempting to trace back the present practices of their Church to the times of our Lord and his Apostles; and whatever judgment our candid Roman Catholic readers may form of the fairness or the learning of Cardinal Wiseman or Dr. Milner, we think they must admit that the authorities relied on by such writers, require to be examined into with the utmost caution, before they allow themselves to adopt them as proofs that the modern doctrines of their Church agree with those of the Catholic antiquity of the primitive ages.

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.—No. II.

WE undertook, in our last number, to proceed to consider what has been said by the principal controversial writers of the Church of Rome, in support of their doctrine on this subject.

* We are amused to find, that though Messrs. Berington and Kirk, in their original work on the Faith of Catholics (London, 1839, p. 431) give the selfsame extract from this spurious work—falsely attributed to St. Athanasius—and cite it in the same way from the Benedictine edition, (*Serm. in Annunt.* Tom. ii., p. 401), they have been discreet enough in their third and greatly enlarged edition, of 1845, to omit all allusion to it—see p. 342, vol. iii., where, under the head of Invocation of angels and saints, it ought to have been introduced between Eusebius and Hilary.

* Bellar., Tom. II., page 295, De Sanct. Beat. Lib. I., chapter xix., Cologne, 1615.

† Bellar., vol. iii., p. 313. De Cultu Sanct., lib. iii. c. xvi. Cologne, 1615.

‡ Dr. Wiseman's note refers to *Serm. in Annunt.*, t. ii., p. 401, which is the exact volume and page in the Benedictine edition of 1698.

* Athanasia Opera, Tom. ii., Bened. ed., Paris, 1698.

† Bellarmine De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis. Cologne, 1617. Opera, Tom. vii., p. 50.

For the present, we shall limit our inquiries to two of the most conspicuous writers in the present century—Dr. Milner and Cardinal Wiseman.

We have already disposed of two of the principal authorities which are quoted by those distinguished writers, in another article, in our present number—the spurious Homily of St. Athanasius, and the spurious Epistle of St. Basil to Julian the Apostate, to which we beg to refer our readers—p. 84.

Bishop Milner, in his 35th letter, in the "End of Religious Controversy," page 353, cites but one genuine passage in any way bearing on the point; but it is one entitled to the greatest weight, if truly stated, being no less than that of JUSTIN MARTYR, whom Dr. Milner represents as writing thus—

"We venerate and worship the angelic host and the spirits of the prophets, teaching others as we ourselves have been taught." Surely, exclaims the reader, this is worth all you have said on the other side; for it shows that Justin Martyr attests that the Christians of his time, only forty years after the death of St. John the Apostle, venerated and worshipped both the angelic host and the spirits of the departed prophets; nay, more, attests that they had been taught so to do by their predecessors, which brings the testimony up to the very lifetime of St. John!

What, however, will our good readers think of the honesty and accuracy of Dr. Milner, who thus tries to end controversy on the subject, when we show them, by reference to the original, which Dr. Milner avoids, of course, that the passage is not only a grossly garbled one, but clearly mistranslated, and that Justin Martyr, in fact, never said any such thing as Dr. Milner imputes to him.

The passage referred to, and intended to be cited by Dr. Milner, occurs in Justin's first Apology, where having stated, that the Christians could never be induced to worship the demons, whom the heathens worshipped and invoked, he proceeds thus—"Whence also we are called Atheists (men without God); and we confess that, with regard to such supposed gods, we are Atheists, but not so with regard to the most true God, the Father of justice and temperance, and of the other virtues, without any mixture of evil. But both Him and the Son, who came from Him, and taught these things to us, and the host of the other good angels accompanying and made like to Him, and the PROPHETIC SPIRIT, we reverence and worship, honouring them in reason and truth; and, without grudging, delivering the doctrine to every one who is willing to learn as we were taught."*

Now, whatever doubt a Greek scholar might possibly entertain as to the true translation of this passage in other respects, as to which we shall say a word presently, how any man of Milner's pretensions could have dared to transmute ΠΝΕΥΜΑ τὸ προφητικόν, (the prophetic Spirit of God, worshipped by the primitive Christians, as He is still, as the third person of the Blessed Trinity), into the disembodied spirits of the prophets, is somewhat amazing! But what will not those who value short-lived victory more than permanent truth venture upon, in the vain hope that the ignorance of their readers may save them from the exposure they merit?†

We admit that there is some ambiguity in the other part of the passage, and are aware, as Dr. Milner must also have been, that the ablest critics in the Roman Church are much divided as to the proper translation of the clause relating to the angels; some translating it as we do, "Him [God] and his Son who came from him, and taught us and the army of good angels those things, and the Holy Spirit we venerate and adore;" and others, "Him and his Son who came from him, and taught us those things, and the army of good angels and the Holy Spirit, we venerate and adore." The former making the word "taught" govern the words, "the army of the other good angels," while the latter makes the words, "revere and worship" govern the word, "angels." Supposing, however, each of these constructions to be possible grammatically, that the latter cannot be the true interpretation, will, we think, be clear to any one who plainly and closely considers the matter. To suppose it, would be to impute to Christians the practice of paying to the host of angels, the selfsame reverence, worship, and honour, which we pay to the Holy Trinity, the Supreme Father, His ever Blessed Son, and the Holy Spirit, and even placing the angels before the third person of the Trinity. All will revolt from such an interpretation, as not only impious, but contrary to the principles professed by the most celebrated Roman Catholic writers; and every candid man must, we think, admit, that if Justin Martyr had intended to re-

present the holy angels as objects of religious worship (which in no other passage of his writings is there the slightest trace of), he would have selected some more appropriate place for so stating, and would not so violently have thrust the mention of them among the Persons of the ever blessed Trinity, assigning to them a place between the second and third Persons of the eternal hypostatic union!

Feeling this strongly, and anxious to avoid the charge of impiety, some writers (and, among others, the Benedictine editor of Justin)† have attempted to draw a distinction between the two verbs in this passage, "reverence and worship," alleging that the lower degree of "reverence" expressed by the latter, applies to the angels; whilst the former verb, implying the higher degree of worship, alone relates to the Godhead. But this distinction rests on a false assumption; for the two words (σεβόμεθα) we reverence, and (προσκυνούμεν) we worship, are used equally to convey the idea of the highest religious worship, as is familiar to every scholar, who has studied the Septuagint and the Greek Testament.‡

In determining the true meaning of an obscure passage, grammatically susceptible of two different acceptations, the author himself is often his own best interpreter; and if he has expressed, in another place, the same leading sentiment, without the same obscurity, and free from all doubt, surely, the light borrowed from that passage ought to be used to fix the sense of the ambiguous one, and establish the author's consistency?

Now, Justin, in the very same treatise, a few passages further on, again defends the Christians against the same charge of being Atheists, and on the selfsame ground—first, "that they worship the Father, who is maker of all; secondly, the Son, proceeding from Him; and, thirdly, the Holy Ghost." In both cases he refers to the same attributes of the Son, as the teacher of Christian truth, and of the Holy Ghost, as the Prophetic Spirit. The following extracts are the only parts necessary for our present purpose—"Who of sound mind will not confess that we are not Atheists, reverencing, as we do, the Maker of the universe, and Him who taught us true things, and who was born for this purpose—Jesus Christ crucified under Pontius Pilate. . . . Instructed, as we are, that He is the Son of the true God, and holding Him in the second place; and the Prophetic Spirit in the third order, we, with reason, honour."§ In which passage he makes no mention or allusion whatever to the angels, either before or after the Holy Spirit.

We would also, in confirmation of this view, refer our readers to another passage in the same treatise, No. 17, in which Justin distinctly says, "We adore God alone." (Θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνούμεν.)§

We have no doubt, therefore, that the true meaning of the passage, cited in so unfair and garbled a manner (to say the least of it) by Dr. Milner, in his "End of Controversy," is as follows—"Honouring in reason and truth, we reverence and worship Him, the Father of Righteousness, and the Son (who proceeds from Him; and instructed in those things both ourselves, and the host of the true good angels following Him, and made like unto Him), and the Prophetic Spirit"—in which interpretation we follow the learned Grabe and Langus, entitled the interpreter of Justin, and other eminent writers.¶ (See S. Justini Apologia Prima cum Latina Joannis Langi versione. Edit. a J. E. Grabe, Oxoniae, 1700, p. 11.)

We have now, we think, at least, said enough to satisfy our readers that Dr. Milner's version of the passage is not to be depended on, and that Justin Martyr cannot be considered an authority for the invocation of Angels. As to the invocation of Saints, there is not a suggestion, we venture to assert, from one end of his work to the other.

We had intended to proceed in our present number with another great controversial writer, Cardinal Wiseman, who has, in several articles, attempted to defend the practice of saint-worship; but this would embark us in a disputation too long for the state of our pages, and may, we think, be judiciously postponed till our next, especially as we have already alluded to a quotation of Cardinal Wiseman, in another article (see p. 84), which we desire to give him and his friends an opportunity of explaining before making any further attack upon the character of his authorities.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

* Opera Justin. Paris, 1742; Præfat. Pars. ii., cap. iv., p. xxii. † Exod. xxxiv. 14; Ps. xciv. (xcv) 6; 1 Sam. (1 Kings) xv. 25; 2 Kings (1 Kings) xvii. 36; Heb. i. 6; Acts xviii. 7, 13, xix. 27.

‡ Bened. Ed. Paris, p. 51.

§ Bened. Ed. p. 54.

¶ Any one who desires to investigate the matter further will do well to consult Bishop Kaye's excellent work on Justin Martyr, p. 53 (Second edition, London, 1836); and Mr. Tyler's Primitive Christian Worship, p. 107 to 114.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JULY, 1854.

THE connection between personal interests and systems of opinions has ever proved the greatest source of intolerance, as well as the greatest obstacle to the progress of truth in the world.

It is this clashing with their personal interests which has so often led the priesthood to represent a departure from their dogmas as the worst of crimes, and made them so ready to defend, by other than intellectual means, any doctrines with which their interest, power, and importance are closely interwoven.

We can scarcely, therefore, be surprised that the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland should avail themselves of all the means in their power to deter the laity from reading any publication likely to promote discussion as to the true nature and character of their authority, or the truth and accuracy of the doctrines which they teach.

That they should iterate and reiterate in private to individuals, and in public in their chapels—in neither of which ways it is possible for us to join issue with them—that our journal is a tissue of lies and calumnies, is no more than we expected; and the vagueness and sweeping character of the assertion constitute, perhaps, its best refutation.

To meet charges of such a nature by counter assertions, that we have never wilfully stated a single falsehood, or distorted a truth, would, of course, carry no additional conviction to the mind of any one, and we shall not, therefore, waste time, by a vain attempt to persuade those whose prejudices induce them to condemn unheard all who differ with them.

We cannot refrain, however, from quoting a passage from the celebrated Pascal, when defending himself against the calumnies propagated by the Jesuit Fathers against the Jansenists:—

"Other sorts of slander are rather too easily discredited; but you have those of a more subtle character, in which you abstain from specifying particulars, in order to preclude your opponents from getting any hold, or finding any means of reply—as for example, when Father Brisacier says that 'his enemies are guilty of crimes which he does not choose to mention,' would you not think it were impossible to prove a charge so vague as this to be a calumny? An able man, however, has found out the secret of it, and it is a Capuchin friar, Fathers—Father Valerian, of the house of the Counts of Magnis. He had happily succeeded in converting Prince Ernest, the Landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels; your Fathers, however, seized, as it would appear, with some chagrin, at seeing a sovereign prince converted without their having had any hand in it, immediately wrote a book against the friar, and, also, circulated a letter against him, in which they said—'Ah! we have such things to disclose as will galling you to the quick! If you don't take care, we shall be forced to inform the Pope and cardinals about it.' This manoeuvre was pretty well executed, and, I doubt not, Fathers, but you speak in the same style of me; but take warning from the manner in which the friar answered it in his book, printed last year at Prague—'What shall I do,' says he, 'to counteract those vague and indefinite insinuations? How is it possible to refute charges which have never been specified? Here, however, is my plan—I declare, loudly and openly, to those who have traduced me, that if they do not discover these crimes before the whole world, they are notorious slanderers, and most impudent liars. Come forth, then, mine accusers! and proclaim your lies upon the house tops, instead of telling them in the ear, and keeping yourselves out of harm's way by so telling them. In the meantime, I shall content myself with declaring MENTRIS IMPUDENTISSIME. If the charges they make against me be true, let them prove it; otherwise they stand convicted of falsehood, aggravated by the grossest effrontery. Their procedure, in this case, will show who has the right on his side. I desire all men to take particular observation of it; and beg to remark, in the meantime, that this precious cabal, who will not suffer the most trifling charge, which they can possibly repel, to lie upon them, make a show of enduring, with great patience, those from which they cannot vindicate themselves, and

* του αληθεστατου και πατρος δικαιοσυνης και σωφροσύνης ἀλλ' ἐκείνόν τε και τον παρ' αὐτου υἱον ἐλθόντα και διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα και τον των ἄλλων ἐπομένων και ἐξομολογούντων ἀγαθων ἀγγέλων στρατόν πνευμα τε το προφητικον σεβόμεθα και προσκυνούμεν.

Et confitemur quidem nos talium qui habentur Deorum esse expertes et atheos, sed non verissimi illius Dei; Paris videlicet justitiae et temperantiae et virtutum altarium; verum hunc ipsum qui ab eo venit, atque hunc nos et aliorum sequentium et assimilatorum bonorum angelorum exercitum docuit Filium et Spiritum Propheticum colimus et adoramus, cum ratione et veritate venerantes, atque unicuique discere volenti et edocui sumus, candidè tradentes.—Justin Martyr, Apologia Prima, p. 11, cum notis Thiribii, 1722.